

REMARKS

Applicant thanks Examiner Dwivedi for the analysis set forth in the Office Action mailed September 24, 2007. Applicant has carefully considered the comments provided in the Office Action. Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow.

Drawings

In the disclosure, applicant used the terms "pigs" and "thrusters pigs" interchangeably. The element was designated by reference numeral 6. Both terms have been replaced in the disclosure and in the claims by the generic term "pipeline pigs" in order to address the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicant submits that this feature is shown in the drawings.

The term "thruster propulsion system" was an umbrella term used in the disclosure. In view of the Examiner's objection, it has been deleted from the claims.

The use of "capsules" was described in the disclosure; however, this feature is not recited in any of the claims under examination. Therefore, the objection in this regard under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) is believed to be moot.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action asserted that applicant has failed to clearly define the structure of "pigs" and "thruster pigs." The Office Action then recited alternative definitions of "pigs" that include "iron pigs", which were defined by Attachment 1 provided by the Examiner as "crude castings of metal".

Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would understand that the term "pig" when used in connection with movement of fluids through "pipelines" is a "pipeline pig." The term "pipeline pig" is extremely well known and extensively used. A search has been performed to

provide the Examiner with some recent patents referring to "Pipeline Pig." These additional patents are identified herewith in a supplemental Information Disclosure Statement.

Applicant has also asked two independent experts, with extensive industry experience to provide Declarations providing background regarding the use of pipeline pigs by the pipeline industry. These declarations are submitted herewith under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132.

In preparing the patent application, it had been taken for granted that the reader would possess a minimum level of knowledge of pipeline pigs. Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would not question what a "pig" is in this context.

To advance the prosecution of the application (without narrowing the scope of the claims), applicant has removed the term "thruster pig" from the patent application. Upon consideration of the Examiner's objection, it was determined that the term "thruster pig" was a term coined by applicant in an attempt to differentiate his pipeline pigs from existing pipeline pigs. The commonly recognized term is "pipeline pig" and that term has been substituted therefor. To the applicant's knowledge, there has never before been a pipeline pig with motive power to move through a pipeline faster than the fluid flow caused by pipeline pressure.

The term "thruster propulsion system" has been removed from Claims 1, 25 and 43. In Claim 43, the phrase was redundant. The disclosure describes a number of alternative systems for propelling the pipeline pig. Those alternative systems were outlined in applicant's previous response and, for that reason, need not be repeated here.

This amendment is believed to address the concerns raised in the Office Action. It is respectfully submitted that this amendment is fully supported by the disclosure and does not involve the introduction of any new matter.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 25-27 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Foreman et al.

In the prior art, pipeline pigs were pushed by gas or liquid. They had no capability of moving faster than the pressure of the fluid flow provided by the pressure system of the pipeline. The present application provides for pipeline pigs that move through the pipeline faster than the pressure of the fluid flow, so the fluid is being pushed at speeds faster than the pressure system is capable of moving it. Claim 25, as amended, specifies there are "means for propelling the pipeline pigs sequentially through the pipeline containing fluid at speeds in excess of fluid flow provided by a pressure system for the pipeline." Applicant respectfully submits that carrier 12 of Foreman et al is moved by air flow. It has no capability of moving faster than the air flow.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}



Kevan L. Morgan
Registration No. 42,015
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1712

KLM:jlb

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100